

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 36, 37, 47 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

5 Claim 58 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

10 In rejecting claims 36 and 47, the Office argues that “using the IP address to monitor requests for pseudonymous email addresses” (claim 36, lines 10-11 and claim 47 lines 12-13) is unclear. Specifically, the Office argues that it is “unclear if the IP address is used to monitor the request that contains the IP address, or if it used to monitor other requests not associated with the IP or entity, or if another different type of monitoring is intended,” (*Office Action* ¶ 6). Applicant respectfully submits that the claim was definite in its original form. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended the claim in order to expedite prosecution. The specification supports the claims as amended. Claims 36 and 47 are (and were) in compliance with § 112 and thus the Office’s rejection is traversed.

20 In rejecting claims 37 and 48, the Office argues that “modifying routing rules to direct e-mail to the pseudonymous e-mail address to discard” (claim 37, lines 2-3 and claim 48 lines 5-6) is unclear as to what is being discarded (*Office Action* ¶ 7). Applicant respectfully submits that the claim was definite in its original form. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended the claim in order to expedite prosecution. The specification supports the claims as amended. Claims 37 and 48

are (and were) in compliance with § 112 and thus the Office's rejection is traversed.

In rejecting Claim 58, the Office alleges that "the written description fails to disclose the corresponding structure, material, or acts for the claimed function," (Office Action ¶ 8). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 58 is supported by the Specification. Claim 58 recites "means for receiving a request for a pseudonymous e-mail address *associated with a requester*, the request containing at least an address associated with the *requester*" (added subject matter appears in bold italics) of which at least one example can be found in the Specification at paragraph 46, lines 5-7, "Alias generator 100 can receive from HTTP server a set of information in the alias generation request. Identifying information includes information such as the IP address of the node making the HTTP request."

Further, claim 58 recites "means for responsive to receiving the request, creating a pseudonymous e-mail address; means for associating the pseudonymous e-mail address with an e-mail address; (and) means for causing communication of the pseudonymous e-mail address to the *requester*" (added subject matter appears in bold italics) of which at least one example can be found in the Specification at paragraph 32, lines 8-10, "alias generator 100 provides an alias to a node of the Internet 104, and provides both the alias and a set of rules associated with the alias to mail server 102."

Additionally, claim 58 recites "means for storing the address *associated with the requester* with the associated pseudonymous e-mail address," and "means

for using the address *associated with the requester* to monitor *incoming* requests for pseudonymous e-mail addresses to ascertain whether the address *associated with the requester* is associated with *an email address harvesting entity*” (added subject matter appears in bold italics). But one example of this subject matter can be found in the Specification at paragraph 46, lines 7-11, “IP addresses associated with incoming requests can be stored by alias generator 100 and correlated to monitor alias request activity ... to determine that a node requesting e-mail addresses is a harvesting application.”

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 58 is allowable and the Office’s rejection is traversed.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 36, 37, 39-48 and 50-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 7,054,906 to Levosky (hereinafter “Levosky”) in view of US Publication No. 2003/0225841 to Song et al. (hereinafter “Song”).

Claims 3, 38 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levosky in view Song in view of US Publication No. 2004/0177110 to Rounthwaite et al. (hereinafter “Rounthwaite”).

Applicant makes no representation that cited references are prior art. This response and any remarks or comments included herein are not intended to be, and are not to be interpreted as, an admission that any cited references are prior art.

Applicant reserves the right to dispose of any cited reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103, including but not limited to antedating any one or more of the cited references.

5 **The Claims**

Claim 1 has been amended and, as amended recites a pseudonymous email address generator comprising [emphasis added]:

- a request interface configured to receive a pseudonymous email address generation request, the request being associated with a requester, the request containing identification information including at least an address associated with the requester; and
- a computer-readable medium embodying computer-readable instructions that implement a pseudonymous email address creator configured to:
 - create a pseudonymous email address associated with a mail server in response to the received pseudonymous email address generation request,
 - associate the pseudonymous email address with an email address,
 - provide the created pseudonymous email address and its associated email address to the mail server,
 - cause the created pseudonymous email address to be provided to the requester; and
 - ***use the address associated with the requester to correlate monitoring for other pseudonymous email address generation requests associated with an email address harvesting entity.***

 Support for this amendment can be found throughout the Specification, for example ¶¶ [0045] and [0046] of the Specification as filed. In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office alleges that its subject matter is obvious over

Levosky in view of Song. In light of the above amendment and for reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejection.

This claim has been amended to recite *“us[ing] the address associated with the requester to correlate monitoring for other pseudonymous email address generation requests associated with an email address harvesting entity.”*

Levosky and Song, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest any such subject matter. The Office concedes that “Levosky fails to explicitly teach that the website information includes an IP address associated with the entity, and ascertaining whether the IP address is associated with [an entity]” then cites Song ¶ 51 as curing this deficiency (Office Action, p. 6).

Song fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *“us[ing] the address associated with the requester to correlate monitoring for other pseudonymous email address generation requests associated with an email address harvesting entity”* as recited by claim 1. Rather, Song simply instructs that “upon receiving new mail, the spam mail filter searches the database with spam mail determination base information stored therein for a ...mail sending computer's IP address,” (¶ [0051], lines 1-6).

Song in no way discloses or suggests the subject matter of this claim. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the Office's rejection is traversed.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1, as well as for the additional features that they recite. To the

extent that claim 1 is allowable, the Office's reliance on Rounthwaite in making out the rejection of claim 3 is not seen to add anything of significance.

Claim 36 has been amended and, as amended recites a *computer-implemented* method comprising [emphasis added]:

- receiving a request for a pseudonymous e-mail address, the request being associated with a requester, the request containing at least an address associated with the requester;
- responsive to receiving the request, creating a pseudonymous e-mail address;
- associating the pseudonymous e-mail address with an e-mail address;
- causing communication of the pseudonymous e-mail address to the requester;
- storing the address associated with the requester and the associated pseudonymous e-mail address; and
- *using the address associated with the requester to monitor incoming requests for pseudonymous e-mail addresses to ascertain whether the address associated with the requester is associated with an email address harvesting entity.*

Applicant has amended claim 36 to recite “*using the address associated with the requester to monitor incoming requests for pseudonymous e-mail addresses to ascertain whether the address associated with the requester is associated with an email address harvesting entity.*” As discussed above, support for this amendment can be found in Applicant's Specification ¶¶ [0045] and [0046].

In making out the rejection of claim 36 the Office alleges that its subject matter is obvious over Levosky in view of Song for substantially the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 1. In light of the above amendments and for

reasons similar to those discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 36 is allowable.

Claims 37-46 depend from claim 36 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 36, as well as for the additional features that they recite. To the extent that claim 36 is allowable, the Office's reliance on Rounthwaite in making out the rejection of claim 38 is not seen to add anything of significance.

Claim 47 has been amended and, as amended recites an article of manufacture including a computer-readable storage medium having instructions stored thereon that, responsive to execution by a computing device, cause the computing device to perform operations comprising [emphasis added]:

- receiving a request for a pseudonymous e-mail address, the request being associated with a requester, the request containing at least an address associated with the requester;
- responsive to receiving the request, creating a pseudonymous e-mail address;
- associating the pseudonymous e-mail address with an e-mail address;
- causing communication of the pseudonymous e-mail address to the requester;
- storing the address associated with the requester with the associated pseudonymous e-mail address; and
- *using the address associated with the requester to monitor incoming requests for pseudonymous e-mail addresses to ascertain whether the address associated with the requester is associated with an email address harvesting entity.*

Applicant has amended claim 47 to recite “*using the address associated with the requester to monitor incoming requests for pseudonymous e-mail addresses to ascertain whether the address associated with the requester is*

associated with an email address harvesting entity.” As discussed above, support for this amendment can be found in Applicant’s Specification ¶¶ [0045] and [0046].

In making out the rejection of claim 47 the Office alleges that its subject matter is obvious over Levosky in view of Song for substantially the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 1. In light of the above amendments and for reasons similar to those discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 47 is allowable.

Claims 48-57 depend from claim 47 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 47, as well as for the additional features that they recite. To the extent that claim 47 is allowable, the Office’s reliance on Rounthwaite in making out the rejection of claim 49 is not seen to add anything of significance.

Claim 58 has been amended and, as amended recites a system comprising [emphasis added]:

- means for receiving a request for a pseudonymous e-mail address, the request being associated with a requester, the request containing at least an address associated with the requester;
- means for responsive to receiving the request, creating a pseudonymous e-mail address;
- means for associating the pseudonymous e-mail address with an e-mail address;
- means for causing communication of the pseudonymous e-mail address to the requester;
- means for storing the address associated with the requester with the associated pseudonymous e-mail address; and
- *means for using the address associated with the requester to monitor incoming requests for pseudonymous e-mail addresses to ascertain whether the address associated with the requester is associated with an email address harvesting entity.*

Applicant has amended Claim 58 to recite “*means for using the address associated with the requester to monitor incoming requests for pseudonymous e-mail addresses to ascertain whether the address associated with the requester is associated with an email address harvesting entity.*” As discussed above, support for this amendment can be found in Applicant’s Specification ¶¶ [0045] and [0046].

In making out the rejection of claim 58 the Office alleges that its subject matter is obvious over Levosky in view of Song for substantially the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 1. In light of the above amendments and for reasons similar to those discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 58 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

All of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests issuance of a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3/1/2010

By: /Lance R. Sadler/
Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38605
(509) 755-7251